

The German Conservative Revolution & its Legacy

By Lucian Tudor

During the years between World War I and the establishment of the Third Reich, the political, economic, and social crises which Germany suddenly experienced as a result of its defeat in the First World War gave rise to a movement known as the “Conservative Revolution,” which is also commonly referred to as the “Conservative Revolutionary Movement,” with its members sometimes called “Revolutionary Conservatives” or even “Neoconservatives.”

The phrase “Conservative Revolution” itself was popularized as a result of a speech in 1927 by the famous poet Hugo von Hofmannsthal, who was a Catholic cultural conservative and monarchist.[1] Here Hofmannsthal declared, “The process of which I am speaking is nothing less than a conservative revolution on such a scale as the history of Europe has never known. Its object is form, a new German reality, in which the whole nation will share.”[2]

Although these phrases give the impression that the Conservative Revolution was composed of people who shared the same worldview, this was in fact not the case because the thinkers and leaders of the Conservative Revolution often had disagreements. Furthermore, despite the fact that the philosophical ideas produced by this “new conservatism” influenced German National Socialism and also had links to Fascism, it is incorrect to assume that the people belonging to it are either Fascist or “proto-Nazi.” Although some Revolutionary Conservatives praised Italian Fascism and some also eventually joined the National Socialist Movement (although many did not), overall their worldviews were distinct from both of these political groups.

It is difficult to adequately summarize the views held by the Revolutionary Conservatives due to the fact that many of them held views that stood in contradistinction to certain views held by others in the same movement. What they generally had in common was an awareness of the importance of Volk (this term may be translated as “folk,” “nation,” “ethnicity,” or “people”) and culture, the idea of Volksgemeinschaft (“folk-community”), and a rejection of Marxism, liberalism, and democracy (particularly parliamentary democracy). Ideas that also were common among them was a rejection of the linear concept of history in favor of the cyclical concept, a conservative and non-Marxist form of socialism, and the establishment of an authoritarian elite. [3]

In brief, the movement was made of Germans who had conservative tendencies of some sort but who were disappointed with the state into which Germany had been put by its loss of World War I and sought to advance ideas that were both conservative and revolutionary in nature.

In order to obtain an adequate idea as to the nature of the Conservative Revolution and its outlook, it is best to examine the major intellectuals and their thought. The following sections will provide a brief overview of the most important Revolutionary Conservative intellectuals and their key philosophical contributions.

The Visionaries of a New Reich

The most noteworthy Germans who had an optimistic vision of the establishment of a “Third

Reich” were Stefan George, Arthur Moeller van den Bruck, and Edgar Julius Jung. Stefan George, unlike the other two, was not a typical intellectual but a poet. George expressed his Revolutionary Conservative vision of the “new Reich” largely in poetry, and this poetry did in fact reach and affect many young German nationalists and even intellectuals; and for this he is historically notable.[4] But on the intellectual level, Arthur Moeller van den Bruck (who popularized the term “Third Reich”) and Edgar Julius Jung had a deeper philosophical impact.

1. Arthur Moeller van den Bruck

Moeller van den Bruck was a cultural historian who became politically active at the end of the First World War. He was a founding member of the conservative “June Club,” of which he became the ideological leader.[5] In *Der preussische Stil* (“The Prussian Style”) he described what he believed to be the Prussian character, whose key characteristic was the “will to the state,” and in *Das Recht der jungen Völker* (“The Right of Young Peoples”) he presented the idea of “young peoples” (including Germany, Russia, and America) and “old peoples” (including England and France), advocating an alliance between the “younger” nations with more vitality to defeat the hegemony of Britain and France.[6]

In 1922, he contributed, along with Heinrich von Gleichen and Max Hildebert Boehm, to the book *Die neue Front* (“The New Front”), a manifesto of the Jungkonservativen (“Young-conservatives”).[7] A year later, Moeller van den Bruck produced his most famous work which contained a comprehensive exposition of his worldview, *Das Dritte Reich*, translated into English as *Germany’s Third Empire*. [8]

In *Germany’s Third Empire*, Moeller made a division between four political stances: Revolutionary, Liberal, Reactionary, and Conservative. Revolutionaries, which especially included Communists, were unrealistic in the sense that they believed they could totally brush aside all past values and traditions. Liberalism was criticized for its radical individualism, which essentially amounts to egotism and disintegrates nations and traditions. Reactionaries, on the other hand, were criticized for having the unrealistic position of desiring a complete revival of past forms, believing that everything in past society was positive. The Conservative, Moeller argued, was superior to the former three because “Conservatism seeks to preserve a nation’s values, both by conserving traditional values, as far as these still possess the power of growth, and by assimilating all new values which increase a nation’s vitality.”[9] Moeller’s “Conservative” was essentially a Revolutionary Conservative.

Moeller rejected Marxism because of its rationalism and materialism, which he argued were flawed ideologies that failed to understand the better side of human societies and life. “Socialism begins where Marxism ends,” he declared.[10] Moeller advocated a corporatist German socialism which recognized the importance of nationality and refused class warfare.

In terms of politics, Moeller rejected republicanism and asserted that true democracy was about the people taking a share in determining its destiny. He rejected monarchy as outdated and anticipated a new form of government in which a strong leader who was connected to the people would emerge. “We need leaders who feel themselves at one with the nation, who identify the nation’s fate with their own.” [11] This leader would establish a “Third Empire, a new and final Empire,” which would solve Germany’s political problems (especially its population problem).

2. Edgar Julius Jung

Another great vision of a Third Reich came from Edgar Julius Jung, a politically active intellectual who wrote the large book *Die Herrschaft der Minderwertigen*, translated into English as *The Rule of the Inferiour*, [12] which has sometimes been called the “bible of neo-conservatism.” [13] This book presented a devastating critique of liberalism and combined ideas from Spann, Schmitt, Pareto, and other thinkers.

Liberal democracy was rejected by Jung as the rule of masses which were manipulated by demagogues and also the rule of money because it had inherent tendencies towards plutocracy. The French Revolutionary ideas of “liberty, equality, fraternity” were all rejected as corrosive influences harmful to society and sources of individualism, which Jung viewed as a key cause of decay. Jung also rejected Marxism as a corrupt product of the French Revolution. [14] The Conservative Revolution for Jung was, in his words, the

"Restoration of all those elementary laws and values without which man loses his ties with nature and God and without which he is incapable of building up a true order. In the place of equality there will be inherent standards, in the place of social consciousness a just integration into the hierarchical society, in the place of mechanical election an organic elite, in the place of bureaucratic leveling the inner responsibility of genuine self-government, in the place of mass prosperity the rights of a proud people." [15]

In the place of liberal and Marxist forms, Jung envisioned the establishment of a New Reich which would use corporatist economics (related to the medieval guild system), would be organized on a federalist basis, would be animated by Christian spirituality and the power of the Church, and would be led by an authoritarian monarchy and an elite composed of selected qualified members. In Jung's words, “The state as the highest order of organic community must be an aristocracy; in the last and highest sense: the rule of the best. Even democracy was founded with this claim.” [16]

He also critiqued the materialistic concept of race as “biological materialism” and asserted instead the primacy of the cultural-spiritual entity (it was on this basis, rather than on biology, that the Jewish Problem was to be dealt with). Furthermore, he rejected nationalism in the normal sense of the term, supporting the concept of a federalist, supra-national, pan-European Empire, while still recognizing the reality and importance of Volk and the separateness of ethnic groups. In fact, Jung believed that the new Reich should be formed on “an indestructible volkisch foundation from which the volkisch struggle can take form.” [17]

Edgar Jung, however, was not content with merely writing about his ideas; he had great political ambitions and actively worked with parties and conservatives who agreed with him in the 1920s up until 1934. [18] The necessity of battle was already part of Jung's philosophy: “If the German people see that, among them, combatants still live, then they become aware also of combat as the highest form of existence. The German destiny calls for men who master it. For, world-history makes the man.” [19]

During his political activity, he came to dislike the National Socialist movement due to a personal dislike for Hitler as well as his view that National Socialism was a product of modernity and was ideologically linked with Marxism and liberalism. Jung was highly active in his

opposition to the NSDAP and was eventually responsible for writing Papen's Marburg address which criticized Hitler's government in 1934, which resulted in Jung's death on the Night of the Long Knives.[20]

Theorists of Decline: Spengler and Klages

1. Oswald Spengler

The most famous theorist of decline is Oswald Spengler, the "doctor-prophet" who predicted the fall of the Western High Culture in his magnum opus, *The Decline of the West*. According to Spengler, every High Culture has its own "soul" (this refers to the essential character of a Culture) and goes through predictable cycles of birth, growth, fulfillment, decline, and demise which resemble that of the life of a plant.[21] To quote Spengler:

"A Culture is born in the moment when a great soul awakens out of the proto-spirituality of ever-childish humanity, and detaches itself, a form from the formless, a bounded and mortal thing from the boundless and enduring. It blooms on the soil of an exactly-definable landscape, to which plant-wise it remains bound. It dies when the soul has actualized the full sum of its possibilities in the shape of peoples, languages, dogmas, arts, states, sciences, and reverts into the proto-soul." [22]

There is an important distinction in this theory between *Kultur* ("Culture") and *Zivilisation* ("Civilization"). Culture refers to the beginning phase of a High Culture which is marked by rural life, religiosity, vitality, will-to-power, and ascendant instincts, while Civilization refers to the later phase which is marked by urbanization, irreligion, purely rational intellect, mechanized life, and decadence. Spengler particularly focused on three High Cultures which he made comparisons between: the Magian, the Classical, and the present Western High Culture. He held the view that the West, which was in its later Civilization phase, would soon enter a final imperialistic and "Caesarist" stage – a stage which, according to Spengler, marks the final flash before the end of a High Culture.[23]

Perhaps Spengler's most important contribution to the Conservative Revolution, however, is his theory of "Prussian Socialism" which he expressed in *Prussianism and Socialism*, and which formed the basis of his view that conservatives and socialists should unite. In this short book he argued that the Prussian character, which was the German character par excellence, was essentially socialist. For Spengler, true socialism was primarily a matter of ethics rather than economics.[24]

This ethical, Prussian socialism meant the development and practice of work ethic, discipline, obedience, a sense of duty to the greater good and the state, self-sacrifice, and the possibility of attaining any rank by talent. Prussian socialism was differentiated from Marxism and liberalism. Marxism was not true socialism because it was materialistic and based on class conflict, which stood in contrast with the Prussian ethics of the state. Also in contrast to Prussian socialism was liberalism and capitalism, which negated the idea of duty, practiced a "piracy principle," and created the rule of money.[25]

2. Ludwig Klages

Ludwig Klages was a less influential, although still noteworthy, theorist of decline who focused

not on High Cultures, but on the decline of Life (which stands in contrast to mere Existence). Klages's theory, named "Biocentrism," posited a dichotomy between Seele ("Soul") and Geist ("Spirit"); two forces in human life that were in a psychological battle with each other. Soul may be understood as pure Life, vital impulse, and feeling, while Spirit may be understood as abstract intellect, mechanical and conceptual thought, reason, and Will.[26]

According to Biocentric theory, in primordial pre-historic times, man's Soul and body were united and thus humans lived ecstatically in accordance to the principle of Life. Over time, human Life was interfered with by Spirit, which caused humans to use conceptual (as opposed to symbolic) thought and rational intellect, thus beginning the severing of body and Soul. In this theory, the more human history progresses, the more Life is limited and ruined by the Spirit in a long but ultimately unstoppable process which ends in completely mechanized, over-civilized, and soul-less people. "Already, the machine has liberated itself from man's control," wrote Klages, "it is no longer man's servant: in reality, man himself is now being enslaved by the machine." [27]

This final stage is marked by such things as a complete disconnection from Nature, the destruction of the natural environment, massive race-mixing, and a lack of true Life, which is predicted to finally end in the death of mankind due to damage to the natural world. Klages declared, "... the ultimate destruction of all seems to be a foregone conclusion." [28]

Spann and the Unified State

Othmar Spann was, from 1919 to 1938, a professor at the University of Vienna in Austria who was influential but who, despite his enthusiastic support for National Socialism, was removed by the Third Reich government due to a few ideological disagreements.[29] He was the exponent of a theory known as "Universalism" (which is entirely different from universalism in the normal sense of the term). His Universalist view of economics, politics, society, and science was expounded in numerous books, the most important of which was his most memorable work, *Der wahre Staat* ("The True State").[30]

Spann's Universalism was a corporatist theory which rejected individualism. To understand Spann's rejection of individualism it is necessary to understand what "individualism" is because different and even contradictory definitions are given to that term; individualism here refers to the concept that the individual is absolute and no supra-individual reality exists (and therefore, society is nothing more than a collection of atoms). The reader must be aware that Spann did not make a complete denial of the individual, but rather a complete denial of individualist ideology.[31]

According to Universalist theory, the individual exists only within a particular community or society; the whole (the totality of society) precedes the parts (individuals) because the parts do not truly exist independent from the whole.[32] Spann wrote, "It is the fundamental truth of all social science . . . that it is not the individuals that are the truly real, but the whole, and that the individuals have reality and existence only so far as they are members of the whole." [33]

Furthermore, society and the State were not entirely separable, because from the State comes the rights of the individual, family, and other groups. Liberalism, capitalism, democracy, and Marxian socialism were all rejected by Spann as individualist or materialist and corrupt products

of French Revolutionary ideas. Whereas in past societies the individual was integrated into community, modern life with its liberalism had atomized society. According to Spann, "Mankind can reconcile itself to poverty because it will be and remain poor forever. But to the loss of estate, existential insecurity, uprootedness, and nothingness, the masses of affected people can never reconcile themselves." [34] As a solution to modern decay, Spann envisioned the formation of a religious Christian, corporatist, hierarchical, and authoritarian state similar to the First Reich (the Holy Roman Empire). [35]

A lesser-known Revolutionary Conservative academic, Hans Freyer, also held similar views to Spann and challenged the ideas and results of the "Enlightenment," particularly secularism, the idea of universal reason, the concept of a universal humanity, urbanization, and democratization. Against modern society corrupted by these things, Freyer posed the idea of a "totally integrated society" which would be completed by a powerful, non-democratic state. Culture, Volk, race, and religion would form the basis of society and state in order to restore a sense of community and common values. Freyer also joined the National Socialists believing that the movement would realize his aims but later became disappointed with it because of what he saw as its repressive nature during the Third Reich. [36]

Zehrer and Elitist Theory

Hans Zehrer was a notable contributor to and editor of the "neoconservative" magazine *Die Tat*, and thus eventually also a founding member of a group of intellectuals known as the *Tat-Kreis* ("Tat-Circle"). Zehrer held the view that "all movements began as intellectual movements of intelligent, well-qualified minorities which, because of the discrepancy between that which is and that which should be, seized the initiative." [37] His theory was somewhat related to Vilfredo Pareto's concept of a "circulation of elites" in that he believed that intellectuals, in most cases gifted and intelligent men emerging from any social class, were crucial in determining the succeeding social order and its ideas.

In Germany at that time, the middle class, which made up a large segment of society and of which Zehrer was a member, was facing a number of economic problems. It was Zehrer's dream that a new political order could be established by young intellectuals of the middle class which he attempted to reach. This new order would result in the abolishment of the insecure Weimar republic and the establishment of an authoritarian elite made up largely of such intellectuals. This elite would not be subject to control by the masses and would choose its own members based on the criterion of personal quality and ability without regard to social class or wealth. [38]

Zehrer's vision was not fulfilled due to a series of failures to establish a new state by a "revolution from above" as well because of the rise of the NSDAP, which he attempted to influence in the early 1930s despite his disdain for party rule and, after being unsuccessful, retreated from political activity. However, although most Revolutionary Conservative thinkers did not envision an elite composed almost solely of intellectuals, it is notable that they shared with Zehrer the view that an authoritarian elite should have its membership open to qualified individuals of all classes and ranks. [39]

Sombart and Conservative Socialism

Socialists with nationalist and conservative leanings such as Paul Lensch, Johann Plenge, Werner

Sombart, Arthur Moeller van den Bruck, and Oswald Spengler to the rise of a new, national, conservative socialism. Of course, it should be remembered that non-Marxist socialism already had a long history in Germany, including such people as the Kathedersozialisten (“socialists of the chair”), Adolf Stöcker, and Ferdinand Tönnies.[40] Werner Sombart himself began as a Marxist, but later became disillusioned with Marxist theory, which he realized was destructive of the human spirit and organic community much in the same way capitalism was.

Sombart is for the most part remembered for his work on the nature of capitalism, especially his works linking the materialistic character of the Jews with capitalism. The obsession with profit, ruthless business practices, indifference to quality, and “the merely rationalizing and abstracting characteristics of the trader” which were key products of capitalism, destroy any “community of labor” and disintegrate bonds between people which were more common in medieval society.[41] Sombart wrote, “Before capitalism could develop, the natural man had to be changed out of all recognition, and a rationalistically minded mechanism introduced in his stead. There had to be a transvaluation of all economic values.”[42]

Sombart’s major objections to Marxism consisted of the fact that Marxism aimed to suppress all religious feelings as well as national feelings and the values of rooted, indigenous culture; Marxism aimed not at a higher mankind but mere base “happiness.” In contrast to Marxism and capitalism, Sombart advocated a German Socialism in which economic policies would be “directed in a corporative manner,” exploitation would be ended, and hierarchy and the welfare of the whole state would be upheld.[43]

Radicalism and Nationalism: Jünger and Niekisch

1. Ernst Jünger

Ernst Jünger is well-known for his work on what he saw as the positive effects of warfare and battle, with himself having experienced these in World War I. Jünger rejected the bourgeois civilization of comfort and security, which he saw as weak and dying, in favor of the hardening and “magnificent” experience of action and adventure in war, which would transform a man of the bourgeois world into a “warrior.” The warrior type battled “against the eternal Utopia of peace, the pursuit of happiness, and perfection.”[44] Jünger believed that the crisis and restlessness of Germans after the World War was essentially a good thing.

In his book *Der Arbeiter*, the “warrior” was followed by the “worker,” a new type which would become dominant after the end of the bourgeois order. Jünger had realized that modern technology was changing the world; the individual man was losing his individuality and freedom in a mechanized world. Thus he anticipated a society in which people would accept anonymity in the masses and obedient service to the state; the population would undergo “total mobilization.”[45] To quote Jünger:

"Total Mobilization is far less consummated than it consummates itself; in war and peace, it expresses the secret and inexorable claim to which our life in the age of masses and machines subjects us. It thus turns out that each individual life becomes, ever more unambiguously, the life of a worker; and that, following the wars of knights, kings, and citizens, we now have wars of workers. The first great twentieth-century conflict has offered us a presentiment of both their rational structure and their mercilessness."[46]

Ernst Jünger's acceptance of technology in the "worker" stage stands somewhat in contrast to the position taken by his brother, Friedrich Georg Jünger, who wrote critiques of modern technological civilization (although Ernst would later in life agree with this view).[47] Ernst Jünger later changed in his attitudes during World War II, and afterwards nearly inverted his entire worldview, praising peace and individualism; a change which had not come without criticism from the Right.[48]

2. Ernst Niekisch

Another notable radical nationalist in the Conservative Revolution was Ernst Niekisch, who began as a Communist but eventually turned to a seemingly paradoxical mixture of German nationalism and Russian communism: National Bolshevism. In accordance with this new doctrine, Niekisch advocated an alliance between Soviet Russia and Germany in order to overcome the Versailles Treaty as well as to counter the power of the capitalist and anti-nationalist Western nations. However, this deviant faction, in competition with both Communists and anti-Communist nationalists, remained an unsuccessful minority.[49]

Political Theory: Schmitt and Haushofer

1. Carl Schmitt

Carl Schmitt was a notable Catholic philosopher of politics and jurist who was a major influence on political thought and who also supported the Third Reich government after its formation. His most famous book was *The Concept of the Political*, although he is also the author of numerous other works, including *Political Theology* and *The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*.

The "political," for Schmitt, was a concept distinct from politics in the normal sense of the term, and was based on the distinction between "friend" and "enemy." The political exists wherever there exists an enemy, a group which is different and holds different interests, and with whom there is a possibility of conflict. This criterion includes both groups outside of the state as well as within the state, and therefore both inter-state war as well as civil war is taken into account. A population can be unified and mobilized through the political act, in which an enemy is identified and battled.[50]

Schmitt also defended the practice of dictatorship, which he distinguished from "tyranny." Dictatorship is a form of government which is established when a "state of exception" or emergency exists in which it is necessary to bypass slow parliamentary processes in order to defend the law. According to Schmitt, dictatorial power is present in any case in which a state or leader exercises power independently of the approval of majorities, regardless of whether or not this state is "democratic." Sovereignty is the power to decide the state of exception, and thus, "sovereign is he who decides on the exception." [51]

Schmitt further criticized parliamentary or liberal democracy by arguing that the original basis of parliamentarism — which held that the separation of powers and open and rational dialogue between parties would result in a well-functioning state — was in fact negated by the reality of party politics, in which party leaders, coalitions, and interest groups make decisions on policies without a discussion. Another notable argument made by Schmitt was that true democracy is not liberal democracy, in which a plurality of groups are treated equally under a single state, but a unified, homogenous state in which leaders' decisions express the will of the unified people. In

Schmitt's words, "Every actual democracy rests on the principle that not only are equals equal but unequals will not be treated equally. Democracy requires, therefore, first homogeneity and second – if the need arises elimination or eradication of heterogeneity." [52]

2. Karl Haushofer

Karl Haushofer was another philosopher of politics who is well-known for his theoretical work on "geopolitics" which aimed to advance Germany's understanding of international politics and geography. Haushofer asserted that nations not only had the right to defend their land, but also to expand and colonize new lands, especially when experiencing over-population. Germany was one nation in such a position, and was thus entitled to Lebensraum ("living-space") for its excess population. In order to overcome the domination of the Anglo-American power structure, Haushofer advocated a new system of alliances which particularly involved a German-Russian alliance (thus Haushofer can be viewed as a "Eurasianist"). Haushofer joined the National Socialists but his ideas were eventually rejected by Third Reich geopoliticians because of their hostility to Russia. [53]

The Influences of the Conservative Revolution

The thinkers of the Conservative Revolution had not only an immediate influence in Germany during the early 20th Century, but also a deep and lasting impact on right-wing (and in some cases even left-wing) thought up to the present day. Aside from the obvious influence on National Socialism, and if we assume that Otto Strasser cannot be included as part of the Conservative Revolution, then Strasserism was still clearly influenced by Arthur Moeller van den Bruck and Oswald Spengler. [54]

Francis Parker Yockey, the author of *Imperium*, also revealed influence from Spengler, Schmitt, Sombart, and Haushofer. [55] Julius Evola, the famous Italian traditionalist, is yet another writer who was affected by Revolutionary Conservative intellectuals, as is clear in such major works as *Men Among the Ruins* [56] and *The Path of Cinnabar*. [57]

More recently, the European New Right shows a great amount of inspiration from Revolutionary Conservatives. Armin Mohler, who may himself be considered a part of Germany's Conservative Revolution as well as the New Right, is well-known for his seminal work *Die Konservative Revolution in Deutschland 1918–1932*. [58] In addition, Tomislav Sunic also draws many intellectual concepts from Revolutionary Conservatives in his highly important book, *Against Democracy and Equality*, including Schmitt, Spengler, and to a lesser extent Spann and Sombart. [59]

Yet another intellectual in league with the New Right, Alexander Jacob, is the translator of Jung's *The Rule of the Inferiour* and is also responsible for multiple works on various Revolutionary Conservatives. [60] When one considers these facts, it becomes apparent that much can be learned by studying the history and ideas of the German Conservative Revolution. It is a source of philosophical richness which can advance the Conservative position and which leaves its mark on the thought of the Right even today.

Notes

[1] On Hofmannsthal's political views, see Paul Gottfried, "Hugo von Hofmannsthal and the

Interwar European Right.” *Modern Age*, Vol. 49, No. 4 (Fall 2007), pp. 508–19.

[2] Hugo von Hofmannsthal, *Das Schrifttum als geistiger Raum der Nation* (Munich, 1927). Quoted in Klemens von Klemperer, *Germany's New Conservatism; Its History And Dilemma In The Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), p. 9.

[3] Armin Mohler, *Die Konservative Revolution in Deutschland 1918–1932* (Stuttgart: Friedrich Vorwerk Verlag, 1950).

[4] Robert Edward Norton, *Secret Germany: Stefan George and his Circle* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002).

[5] Klemperer, *Germany's New Conservatism*, pp. 102–111.

[6] Klemperer, *Germany's New Conservatism*, pp. 156–159.

[7] Mohler, *Die Konservative Revolution in Deutschland*, p. 329.

[8] Arthur Moeller van den Bruck, *Germany's Third Empire* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1971).

[9] *Ibid.* p. 76.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 245.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 227.

[12] Edgar Julius Jung, *The Rule of the Inferiour*, trans. Alexander Jacob (Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellon Press, 1995).

[13] Larry Eugene Jones, “Edgar Julius Jung: The Conservative Revolution in Theory and Practice,” *Conference Group for Central European History of the American Historical Association*, vol. 21, Issue 02 (June 1988), p. 142.

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] Edgar J. Jung, *Deutsche uber Deutschland* (Munich, 1932), p. 380. Quoted in Klemperer, *Germany's New Conservatism*, pp. 121–22.

[16] Jung, *The Rule of the Inferiour*, p. 138.

[17] Jung, “Sinndeutung der konservativen Revolution in Deutschland.” Quoted in Jones, “Edgar Julius Jung,” p. 167. For an overview of Jung’s philosophy, see: Jones, “Edgar Julius Jung,” pp. 144–47, 149; Walter Struve, *Elites Against Democracy; Leadership Ideals in Bourgeois Political Thought in Germany, 1890-1933* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1973), pp. 317–52; Alexander Jacob’s introduction to *Europa: German Conservative Foreign Policy 1870–1940* (Lanham, MD, USA: University Press of America, 2002), pp. 10–16.

[18] Jones, “Edgar Julius Jung,” pp. 145–48.

[19] Jung, *The Rule of the Inferiour*, p. 368.

[20] Jones, “Edgar Julius Jung,” pp. 147–73.

- [21] Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West* Vol. 1: Form and Actuality (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926).
- [22] Ibid. p. 106.
- [23] Ibid. For a good overview of Spengler's theory, see Tomislav Sunic, *Against Democracy and Equality: The European New Right* (Third Edition. London: Arktos, 2010), pp. 91–98.
- [24] Oswald Spengler, *Selected Essays* (Chicago: Gateway/Henry Regnery, 1967).
- [25] Ibid.
- [26] See: Joe Pryce, "On The Biocentric Metaphysics of Ludwig Klages," Revilo-Oliver.com, 2001, http://www.revilo-oliver.com/Writers/Klages/Ludwig_Klages.html, and Lydia Baer, "The Literary Criticism of Ludwig Klages and the Klages School: An Introduction to Biocentric Thought." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Jan., 1941), pp. 91–138.
- [27] Ludwig Klages, *Cosmogonic Reflections*, trans. Joe Pryce, 14 May 2001, <http://www.revilo-oliver.com/Writers/Klages/515.html>, 453.
- [28] Ibid., <http://www.revilo-oliver.com/Writers/Klages/100.html>, 2.
- [29] Klemperer, *Germany's New Conservatism*, pp. 204–5.
- [30] Othmar Spann, *Der Wahre Staat* (Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle und Meyer, 1921).
- [31] Barth Landheer, "Othmar Spann's Social Theories." *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (Apr., 1931), pp. 239–48.
- [32] Ibid.
- [33] Spann, quoted in Ernest Mort, "Christian Corporatism." *Modern Age*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (Summer 1959), p. 249. http://www.mmsi.org/ma/03_03/mort.pdf.
- [34] Spann, *Der wahre Staat*, p. 120. Quoted in Sunic, *Against Democracy and Equality*, pp. 163–64.
- [35] Janek Wasserman, *Black Vienna, Red Vienna: The Struggle for Intellectual and Political Hegemony in Interwar Vienna, 1918–1938* (Saint Louis, Missouri: Washington University, 2010), pp. 73–85.
- [36] Jerry Z. Muller, *The Other God that Failed: Hans Freyer and the Deradicalization of German Conservatism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988). The single book by Hans Freyer to be translated into English is *Theory of Objective Mind*, trans. Steven Grosby (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1998).
- [37] Hans Zehrer, "Die Revolution der Intelligenz," *Tat*, XXI (Oct. 1929), 488. Quoted in Walter Struve, "Hans Zehrer as a Neoconservative Elite Theorist," *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 70, No. 4 (Jul., 1965), p. 1035.

[38] Struve, "Hans Zehrer as a Neoconservative Elite Theorist."

[39] Ibid.

[40] Klemperer, *Germany's New Conservatism*, pp. 57–58. On Tönnies, see Christopher Adair-Toteff, "Ferdinand Tönnies: Utopian Visionary," *Sociological Theory*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Mar., 1995), pp. 58–65.

[41] Alexander Jacob, "German Socialism as an Alternative to Marxism," *The Scorpion*, Issue 21. <http://thescorp.multics.org/21spengler.html>.

[42] Werner Sombart, *Economic Life in the Modern Age* (New Brunswick, NJ, and London: Transaction Publishers, 2001), p. 129.

[43] Jacob, "German Socialism as an Alternative to Marxism."

[44] Ernst Jünger, ed., *Krieg und Krieger* (Berlin, 1930), 59. Quoted in Klemperer, *Germany's New Conservatism*, p. 183. See also Ernst Jünger's *Storm of Steel*, trans. Basil Greighton (London: Chatto & Windus, 1929) and *Copse 125* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1930).

[45] Klemperer, *Germany's New Conservatism*, pp. 185–88.

[46] Ernst Jünger, "Total Mobilization," trans. Joel Golb, in *The Heidegger Controversy* (Boston: MIT Press, 1992), p. 129.
<http://anarchistwithoutcontent.files.wordpress.com/2010/12/junger-total-mobilization-booklet.pdf>.

[47] Alain de Benoist, "Soldier Worker, Rebel, Anarch: An Introduction to Ernst Jünger," trans. Greg Johnson, *The Occidental Quarterly*, vol. 8, no. 3 (Fall 2008), p. 52.

[48] Julius Evola, *The Path of Cinnabar* (London: Integral Tradition Publishing, 2009), pp. 216–21.

[49] Klemens von Klemperer, "Towards a Fourth Reich? The History of National Bolshevism in Germany," *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (Apr., 1951), pp. 191–210.

[50] Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political*, expanded edition, trans. G. Schwab (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

[51] Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, trans. G. Schwab (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), p. 1.

[52] Carl Schmitt, *The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*, trans. E. Kennedy, (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1985), p. 9.

[53] Andrew Gyorgy, "The Geopolitics of War: Total War and Geostrategy." *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (Nov., 1943), pp. 347–62. See also Mohler, *Die Konservative Revolution in Deutschland*, p. 474.

[54] Otto Strasser, *Hitler and I* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1940), pp. 38–39.

[55] Francis Parker Yockey, *Imperium: The Philosophy of History and Politics* (Sausalito, Cal.: Noontide Press, 1962).

[56] Julius Evola, *Men Among the Ruins* (Rochester, Vt.: Inner Traditions, 2002).

[57] Evola, *The Path of Cinnabar*, pp. 150–55.

[58] See note #3.

[59] See Sunic, *Against Democracy and Equality*, pp. 75–98, 159–64.

[60] See Jacob, *Europa*; “German Socialism as an Alternative to Marxism”; *Introduction to Political Ideals* by Houston Stewart Chamberlain (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2005).

Tudor, Lucian. “The Conservative Revolution of Germany & its Legacy.”
Counter-Currents.com, 14 August 2012.

<<http://www.counter-currents.com/2012/08/the-german-conservative-revolution-and-its-legacy/>>.